

### **REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

Applicants would like to thank the Examiner for the careful consideration given the present application. The application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office action.

Claims 1–9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yokoyama (EP 0 522 538 A2) in view of Crowley (USPN 5,493,702).

Claim 1 requires a portable telephone including a portable telephone housing configured by a resin housing and a metal housing. The resin housing and metal housing are parts of the portable telephone.

Yokoyama is cited for teaching a portable telephone with a resin housing. Crowley's docking arrangement housing 16 is cited for teaching a metal housing. However, Crowley's docking arrangement housing 16 is not a part of a portable telephone, but a part of a docking arrangement for a portable telephone 12 (2:66-3:4). In Crowley, a portable telephone 12 having its own portable telephone housing is placed into the docking arrangement housing 16. Clearly, Crowley's docking arrangement housing 16 is not a part of a portable telephone. Applicants submit that the cited combination of references merely teaches a portable telephone with a plastic housing, as taught by Yokoyama, and a separate, metal docking arrangement housing 16, as taught by Crowley. The cited references do not teach, or otherwise render foreseeable, a portable telephone including a portable telephone housing configured by a resin housing and a metal housing.

Claim 1 further requires an internal antenna disposed on a rear surface of a printed circuit board and that the resin housing covers the rear surface of the printed circuit board. Yokoyama is cited for teaching these limitations. Claim 1 also requires that the metal housing covers a front surface of the printed circuit board (the front and rear surfaces are two different surfaces of the

printed circuit board). Crowley's docking arrangement housing 16 is cited for teaching the metal housing.

Crowley's docking system is part of an antenna transmission coupling arrangement for use with portable telephones having an external antenna (see Fig. 1). Crowley's coupling system shields the external antenna (3:7-14), permitting shielded use of the cellular telephone. Yokoyama's telephone has only an internal antenna and, therefore, is incompatible with Crowley's antenna transmission coupling arrangement. Accordingly, one of ordinary skill in the art would not place Yokoyama's telephone into Crowley's docking arrangement. However, for the sake of argument, if Yokoyama's telephone were to be placed into Crowley's docking arrangement, Crowley's docking arrangement housing 16 would cover the rear side of Yokoyama's plastic housing. As shown in Fig. 2, Crowley's housing 16 does not cover the front of a portable telephone. The front surface of Yokoyama's circuit board would be covered by Yokoyama's plastic housing, but not by any metal housing. Applicants submit that the cited references do not teach, or otherwise render foreseeable, a metal housing covering the front surface of the printed circuit board.

Claim 1 further requires that the metal housing covers the front surface of the printed circuit board while leaving at least the part of the printed circuit board on which the internal is disposed uncovered by the metal housing. However, if Yokoyama's telephone were to be placed into Crowley's docking arrangement, the internal antenna in Yokoyama's telephone would be located within Crowley's metal housing 16. Crowley's metal housing 16 could not cover the front surface of Yokohama's printed circuit board while leaving the part of the printed circuit board on which the internal antenna is disposed uncovered. Accordingly, applicants submit that the cited references do not teach, or otherwise render foreseeable, a metal housing that covers the

front surface of a printed circuit board while leaving at least the part of the printed circuit board on which an internal antenna is disposed uncovered by the metal housing.

In view of the above-discussed differences between the subject matter of claim 1 and the cited references, applicants respectfully submit that claim 1 is allowable over said references. Claims 2-4 and 9 depend from claim 1. The arguments provided above with respect to claim 1 also apply to claims 5-8.

New claims 10 and 11 have been added, which respectively depend from above-discussed claims 1 and 5. Claims 10 and 11 require that the curved line that joins the resin housing with the metal housing forms an inflection point on a side wall of the portable telephone housing. None of the prior art of record discloses such a portable telephone housing. As discussed in the present application, a portable telephone housing have such a configuration can provide both bend and twist rigidity, due to the metal housing, without deteriorating the operating characteristics of the internal antenna. See, e.g., application pages 12-14. In view of the differences between the subject matter of claims 10 and 11 and the cited references, applicants respectfully submit that claims 10 and 11 are allowable over said references.

In light of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in a condition for allowance and notice to that effect is hereby requested. If it is determined that the application is not in a condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to initiate a telephone interview with the undersigned attorney to expedite prosecution of the present application.

Appln. No. 09/528,126  
Amendment dated December 29, 2009  
Reply to Office Action dated September 29, 2009

If there are any additional fees resulting from this communication, please charge same to  
our Deposit Account No. 16-0820, our Order No.: NGB-32439.

Respectfully submitted,  
PEARNE & GORDON LLP

By:   
Brad C. Spencer, Reg. No. 57076

1801 East 9th Street  
Suite 1200  
Cleveland, Ohio 44114-3108  
(216) 579-1700

Date: December 29, 2009